

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS:**

Claims 1-2 and 5-20 remain in this application. Claims 3-4 have been previously canceled. Claims 1, 8, 9, 13 and 15 have been amended herein to more clearly and particularly point out Applicant's invention..

Claims 1-2 and 5-8 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Brackett (US Patent No. 4,852,813). In particular, Brackett claims "using a device, which includes a body which is deformable upon impact with the wall of the garbage disposal unit and which is erodable in response to the rotation of the grinder assembly of the garbage disposal unit, the body being made from a material having an elastic memory selected such that the device automatically returns to its original shape after contacting the wall of the garbage disposal unit and having a porosity selected such that the device absorbs fluids" (emphasis added).

In contrast, Applicant's device (tablet) is not deformable. As described on page 8, lines 10-11 of Applicant's specification, the tablet is formed from either particles or particles compressed into tablets. As such, it is clear that neither the particles nor the tablets are made with an elastic memory. Furthermore, Applicant's device also teaches away from Brackett in that the tablet is designed to be ground by the grinder burrs and not ricocheted off the walls of the grinder. In addition, Applicant's device--unlike Bracket--claims the cleaning of the grinder burrs using the tablets and the purging of the soil and the cleaning materials from the grinder without the use of any liquids.

Claims 9-13 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Gabby, et al (U.S. Patent No. 4,328,217). Unlike Applicant, Gabby does not teach, suggest or imply a tablet that is able to be ground into particles by grinder burrs such that the particles dislodge soil from the burrs and wherein the particles and the soil from the burrs are purged from the grinder using only the grinding action of the grinder without the use of liquid.


Claims 15-20 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Kramer (U.S. Patent No. 5,462,427). Unlike Applicant, Kramer does not teach, suggest or imply the pressing together of the materials such that the pressed together materials correspond to the size and shape of the most common type of product that the grinding machine is capable of grinding. Kramer also

does not teach that the pressed object is capable of being ground by the burrs for knocking the soil off the soiled burrs and then the soil and the ground pressed object being purged through the grinding machine without the use of liquid.

Claim 8 has been amended to correctly depend from the appropriate claim.

Claim 13 has been amended to correct the typographical error objected to by the Examiner.

In light of the above, Applicants believe that all of the claim rejections have been obviated. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is now in condition for allowance, which allowance is earnestly solicited.

By  6/30/2010

Romi N. Bose  
Reg. No. 43,322

1157 Banyon Ct.  
Naperville, IL 60540  
Tel.: (630) 355-5144